

REMARKS

Claim 20 was withdrawn from consideration as being directed to a non-elected invention. Claims 1 to 9, 12 to 15 and 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 (b) as being anticipated by Rabjohns (US 5,592,881). Claim 11 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Rabjohns in view of Campbell et al. (US 5,365,587). Claims 16 to 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Rabjohns in view of Kikinis (US 6,137,591). Claims 16 to 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Rabjohns in view of Pepperl + Fuchs.

Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

35 U.S.C. 102 Rejections

Claims 1 to 9, 12 to 15 and 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 (b) as being anticipated by Rabjohns (US 5,592,881).

Rabjohns discloses "At start-up or upon a reconfiguration of the system, each individual module can send to control module 200 its unique identification code as well as another type of code which indicates exactly what type of device (feeder, marking engine, etc.) it is." During operation individual instructions are sent from the controller 200 to the individual modules. See col. 5, lines 37 to 49.

Claim 1 recites "detecting at a controller whether the device attached to or to be attached to the machine is of the first type, the second type or the third type, the controller being capable of preadjusting the device as a function of the detection."

There is absolutely no disclosure or teaching in Rabjohns that controller 200 is "capable of preadjusting the device as a function of the detection" as claimed in claim 1. Absolutely no preadjustment occurs or is capable of occurring using the controller 200 in Rabjohns.

With respect to claim 8, claim 8 recites "wherein the controller automatically adjusts the first device as a function of the information." There is no automatic adjustment disclosed in Rabjohns at all. See [0029] of the preferred embodiment of the present invention.

Withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. 102 rejections is respectfully requested.

With further respect to claim 5, no feeders for a binding line are disclosed at all. A binding line is a post-press device for large printing presses and has nothing to do with binders for copying machines as in Rabjohns.

With further respect to claim 6, claim 6 recites wherein the devices are printing press components. A copier or printer is not a printing press, nor are the components in Rabjohns printing press components.

35 U.S.C. 103 Rejections

Claim 11 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rabjohns in view of Campbell et al. (US 5,365,587).

Campbell has absolutely nothing to do with the device of Rabjohns, and it is respectfully submitted that it would not have been obvious to provide any table to the Rabjohns device in view of Campbell, and the motivation given is not found in any of the cited art.

Claims 16 to 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Rabjohns in view of Kikinis (US 6,137,591).

Neither Rabjohns nor Kikinis shows “the first type or second type being identified by a connection between the power pin and the other pin” as claimed in claim 16 nor is there any reason to combine the references. In addition, since Rabjohns require unique device identification the use of pins would not provide enough information.

Claims 16 to 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Rabjohns in view of Pepperl + Fuchs. Neither Rabjohns nor Pepperl + Fuchs shows “the first type or second type being identified by a connection between the power pin and the other pin” as claimed in claim 16 nor is there any reason to combine the references. In addition, since Rabjohns require unique device identification the use of pins would not provide enough information.

It is respectfully submitted that it would not have been obvious to have combined either Kikinis or Pepperl+Fuchs with Rabjohns.

Withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. 103 rejections is respectfully requested.

Appl. No. 10/796,671

Response to Final Office Action dated April 12, 2006

CONCLUSION

The present application is respectfully submitted as being in condition for allowance and applicants respectfully request such action.

Respectfully submitted,
DAVIDSON, DAVIDSON & KAPPEL, LLC

By: 
William C. Gehris, Reg. No. 38,156

Davidson, Davidson & Kappel, LLC
485 Seventh Avenue
New York, New York 10018
(212) 736-1940